Kerstin Kunze

IUFFyM and Universidad de Salamanca

History of the Universe 0 Havy and Sk •) V ~· Ð Ð U Θ " p 00 LEPTON EPOCH w P 10⁻¹⁰ мес V 00 10⁻¹⁴ sec 2 6 0

Overview

Cosmology 1: The homogeneous universe

★The expansion stages of the universe

Cosmology 2: The inhomogeneous universe

★The cosmic microwave background

★Large scale structure

• Cosmology 3:

★Dark matter

★Dark energy

Kerstin Kunze

- Dark matter
- Evidence for dark matter
- Nature of dark matter ?

Kerstin I	Kunze
-----------	-------

Spiral galaxies



W. Keel; NOAO; D. Malin/AAT)

- Rotation curves of spiral galaxies
- spiral galaxies rotate
- the mass of a (spiral) galaxy can be estimated from its rotation curve.
- measure rotation velocity around center of the galaxy at a distance r: $v_{rot}(r)$
- use stars or gas clouds (hydrogen)
- observe spectrum, use Doppler shift



• 21 cm line









(a) Visible-light view of M83



(b) 21-cm radio view of M83



(c) Near-infrared view of M83

- Assume mass distribution within the central part of galaxy has spherical symmetry: mass inside radius r: $M(\leq r)$





• For a star *in the central region* one expects (density ~ constant)

$$M_r \propto r^3$$
$$\Rightarrow \frac{Gr^3}{r^2} = \frac{v_{rot}^2}{r} \Rightarrow v_{rot} \sim r$$

• For a star *outside* of the central region:





- Therefore the velocity should increase close to the center and decrease at large distance from the galactic center.
- **But**, what is observed is that the rotation curves are quite flat at large distances of the galactic center.
- This means that the dominant part of the galactic mass, that is ~80%-90%, is in the form of a galactic halo of *dark matter*.

Milky Way Halo



Chandra/NASA

- Rotation curves
- NGC 6503



M33





- Dark matter?
- Observations show that only a small part of matter in galaxies is luminous (visible) and it makes up only a small part of the total energy density in the universe.
- Primordial nucleosynthesis (BBN-big bang nucleosynthesis) predicts that the baryonic matter density parameter is $\Omega_b \simeq 0.05$

but observations of the luminous part of galaxies lead to a smaller value:

 $\Omega_{lum} \simeq 0.01$



a part of dark matter is baryonic

- Baryonic dark matter?
- could be brown dwarfs or Jupiters.....or black holes.

stars with mass less than 10% of the solar mass: their core temperatures are not high enough to start nuclear reaction chain



MACHO=massive astrophysical halo object



Observations of MACHOs?







Gravitational Microlensing Resulting from Planetary-Mass Objects in Globular Cluster

The Hubble Space Telescope looks for the small, dim inhabitants of a globular star cluster by studying their effect on the light of distant background stars in the galaxy's bulge. The gravity of the intervening objects in the cluster briefly amplifies the background stars' image by bending light waves, as an optical lens does. The mass of the objects can be inferred by the duration of the lensing event: The longer the brightness lasts, the more massive the objects.





hubblesite.org



The intense gravitational field of a fore-
ground black hole acts like a powerful lens
in space. In the diagram, the black hole "lens"
distorts and brightens the image of a back-
ground star. The gravitational lens smears
the star's image into two banana-shaped
images with a total surface area several
times that of the original stellar disk.

Though the angular separation is shown here, it is 100 times smaller than what HST can resolve. Hence the phenomenon is called "microlensing." HST and other telescopes instead see a brightening of the star as the black hole drifts by, but they do not resolve the multiple images.

hubblesite.org



Light curves

For each object, the top and bottom panels show blue and red passbands, respectively. Flux is in linear units with 1 estimated errors, normalized to the fitted unlensed brightness. Full light curves are shown with 2 day binning; insets of the event regions are unbinned. The thick line shows the fit to unblended microlensing (Table 5), except for probable SN, for which both the unblended fit (solid line) and SN Type Ia fit (dashed line) are shown.

C.Alcock et al. Astrophys. Journal 542 (2000) 281



subtle brightening of a star [located within the box] due to the effect of gravitational microlensing. This phenomenon occurs when a foreground star, in this case a dim red star, passes in front of a much more distant star and amplifies its light. Astronomers were engaged in a largescale search for microlensing events in the halo of our Milky Way galaxy. They were looking in the direction of the Large Magellanic Cloud, a satellite galaxy of our Milky Way. The image was taken in February 1993 with the 50-inch telescope at the Mount **Stromlo Observatory in** Australia. The box represents the field of view of NASA's Hubble Space **Telescope.**

When astronomers used the Mount Stromlo telescope to observe the same region almost a year later, the background star had returned to its normal brightness. The foreground star — the "natural lens" that had magnified the background star had moved away. The ground-based telescope's vision, however, was not keen enough to resolve the stars separately.

So, astronomers used the sharp vision of the Hubble telescope to resolve the stars as two separate objects. The foreground star is red, and is in our galaxy's halo. The background star is blue, and is in the Large Magellanic Cloud. The image was taken on July 11, 2002.

• More evidence of dark matter....



Illustration of the origin of the first acoustic peak in the CMB temperature angular power spectrum

Kerstin Kunze



CLASHEP15

21

- Non baryonic dark matter
- Particles created in the very early universe which are stable so that they are present today
- Candidates:
 - massive neutrinos
 - axions
 - WIMPs=weakly interacting massive particles (example: supersymmetric partners of the standard model particles)

- Neutrinos (SM)
- Determine moment of decoupling of neutrinos
- In the early universe neutrinos stay in equilibrium with the rest of the cosmic plasma by

$$\bar{\nu}_e \nu_e \leftrightarrow e^+ e^-$$

$$\nu_e e^- \leftrightarrow \nu_e e^-$$
 etc.

• Cross section of weak interactions given by

$$\sigma \simeq G_F^2 T^2$$

• where G_F is the Fermi constant.

$$G_F = 1.166 \times 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^{-2}$$

Recall: Hubble parameter in

radiation dominated era

evolves as $H = 1.66g_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{T^2}{M_P}$

- The number density of light particles (relativistic limit) evolves as $n \sim T^3$
- ➡ interaction rate (per neutrino) is

$$\Gamma_{int} = n\sigma |v| \simeq G_F^2 T^2 \times T^3$$

$$\Gamma_{int} \simeq G_F^2 T^5$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{int}}{H} \simeq \frac{G_F^2 T^5}{T^2/M_P}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma_{int}}{H} \simeq \left(\frac{T}{1 \text{ MeV}}\right)^3$$

 $M_P = 1.22 \times 10^{19} \text{ GeV}$

At temperatures above 1 MeV, interaction rate larger than expansion rate

neutrinos coupled to rest of the plasma.

At temperatures below 1 MeV the interaction rate falls below the expansion rate and the interactions of the neutrinos with the particles of the cosmic plasma are no longer efficient to keep them in equilibrium:

➡At a temperature ~1 MeV light neutrinos decouple from the plasma. Afterwards their temperature evolves as 1/a.

- At the time of neutrino decoupling, photons, neutrinos and the rest of matter (which was in thermal equilibrium) had the same temperature.
- If the photon temperature would evolve as a^{-1} , neutrinos and photons would have the same temperature at present.
- But, photon and neutrino are at different temperatures today because g_* changes.
- The change in g_* occurs when the temperature falls below $T \simeq m_e \sim 0.5 \text{ MeV}$ (correpsonds to $5 \times 10^9 \text{ K}$). Below this temperature photons are not energetic enough to create e^+e^- pairs.

temperature)



\rightarrow Change in g_* :



Photons are in equilibrium with electrons and positrons:

$$g_*(\gamma, e^+, e^-) = 2 + \frac{7}{8} \times 4 = \frac{11}{2}$$

- At temperatures $T \ll m_e$: $g_*(\gamma) = 2$
- Conservation of entropy $S = g_*(Ta)^3 = const.$



**** before

annihilation of e^+e^- pairs



$$\frac{(Ta)_{after}^3}{(Ta)_{before}^3} = \frac{g_{*,before}}{g_{*,after}} = \frac{\frac{11}{2}}{2} = \frac{11}{4}$$

after



• The temperature of the (decoupled) neutrinos follows exactly

$$T_{\nu} = \frac{K}{a}$$
 K. constant

$$(aT_{\nu})_{before} = (aT_{\nu})_{after} = K$$

 Before decoupling neutrinos had the same temperature as the photons, upto the moment of decoupling. For temperatures

$$T_D > T \stackrel{>}{\sim} m_e$$



$$T_{\gamma} = T_{\nu}$$

$$T_{\gamma,before} = T_{\nu,before}$$

• Therefore

$$aT_{\gamma})_{after} = \left(\frac{11}{4}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} (T_{\gamma}a)_{before}$$
$$= \left(\frac{11}{4}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} (T_{\nu}a)_{before}$$

• with $(T_{\nu}a)_{before} = (T_{\nu}a)_{after}$

$$(aT_{\gamma})_{after} = \left(\frac{11}{4}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} (T_{\nu}a)_{after}$$

$$\frac{T_{\gamma}}{T_{\nu}} = \left(\frac{11}{4}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \simeq 1.4$$

after annihilation of $e^+e^$ pairs until the present

- Therefore at present there is a background of (light) neutrinos at a temperature CMB: $T_{\gamma,0}\simeq 2.73~{
m K}$

$$T_{\nu,0} = \left(\frac{11}{4}\right)^{-\frac{1}{3}} T_{\gamma,0} \Rightarrow T_{\nu,0} \simeq 1.95 \text{ K}$$

but it has not been *directly* detected yet.

- Number density of neutrinos plus antineutrinos today: $n_{\nu} = \frac{3}{11}n_{\gamma} = 113 \text{ cm}^{-3}$
- This leads to a bound on the total mass assuming that the neutrino contribution does not overclose the universe, that is $\Omega = \frac{\rho}{\rho} \le 1$

$$\sum_{e,\mu,\tau} = m_{\nu}c^2 \le 47 \text{ eV}$$

- Light neutrinos as dark matter have the problem that they were relativistic at decoupling (T~1 MeV) — hot dark matter
- They stream freely under gravity and tend to damp out density perturbations.
- Fraction of hot dark matter has to be subdominant w.r.t. to cold dark matter.
- Constraints on number of neutrino species: BBN and CMB
- For SM neutrinos: $\rho_r = \rho_\gamma \left(1 + \frac{7}{8} \left(\frac{4}{11}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}} N_{eff}\right)$
- \blacksquare changing N_{eff} changes expansion rate (recall $H^2 \sim \rho$)

 \rightarrow changes temperature of freeze-out of n \leftrightarrow p and the ratio

$$\frac{n}{p} = e^{-\frac{Q}{T_D}}$$

⇒changes primordial Helium fraction

 $Y = \frac{m_{He-4,total}}{m_{bariones,total}}$

$$Y = \frac{4\frac{n_n}{2}}{n_n + n_p} = \frac{2\frac{n}{p}}{1 + \frac{n}{p}}$$

PDG 14

• CMB

• the change in the expansion rate at decoupling changes the sound horizon :

$$r_{s} = \int_{0}^{t_{d}} c_{s} \frac{dt}{a} = \int_{0}^{a_{d}} \frac{c_{s} da}{a^{2} H} \quad \text{and the damping scale}$$

$$k_{\gamma}^{-2}(z) = \int_{z}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{6H(z)(1+R)\dot{\tau}} \left(\frac{16}{15} + \frac{R^{2}}{1+R}\right).$$

$$\dot{\tau} = n_{e} \sigma_{T} \frac{a}{a_{0}} \qquad R = \frac{3}{4} \frac{\Omega_{b,0}}{\Omega_{\gamma,0}} (1+z)^{-1}$$
ncreasing N_{eff} decreases damping scale increases small scale

→ increasing N_{eff} decreases damping scale \square increases small scale anisotropies.

Plane	ck 15	68%CL
$N_{\rm eff} = 3.13 \pm 0.32$	Planck TT+lowP;	
$N_{\rm eff} = 3.15 \pm 0.23$	Planck TT+lowP+BAO;	
$N_{\rm eff} = 2.99 \pm 0.20$	Planck TT, TE, EE+lowP	;
$N_{\rm eff} = 3.04 \pm 0.18$	Planck TT, TE, EE+lowP	+BAO.

 Assuming a degenerate mass hierarchy for 3 species of massive neutrinos Planck 15 constrains total mass at 95%CL:

$$\sum m_{\nu} < 0.72 \text{ eV} \quad Planck \text{TT+lowP};$$

$$\sum m_{\nu} < 0.21 \text{ eV} \quad Planck \text{TT+lowP+BAO};$$

$$\sum m_{\nu} < 0.49 \text{ eV} \quad Planck \text{TT}, \text{TE}, \text{EE+lowP};$$

$$\sum m_{\nu} < 0.17 \text{ eV} \quad Planck \text{TT}, \text{TE}, \text{EE+lowP+BAO};$$

- So there is indirect evidence of the cosmic neutrino background. What about direct detection of the cosmic neutrino background?
- Experiments using induced beta decay $\nu_e + {}^3H o {}^3He + e^-$
- KATRIN
- PTOLEMY

- WIMPs (=weakly interacting massive particles)
- assumed to be non relativistic at the time of their decoupling of the rest of the cosmic plasma
 Cold Dark Matter

• General constraint on hypothetical WIMP χ

• "Freeze-out" of interactions when annihilation rate $\chi \bar{\chi}$ falls below expansion rate: $N\langle \sigma v \rangle < H$ o. WIMP-antiWIMP

$$\langle \sigma v \rangle \leq 1$$

number density

σ. WIMP-antiWIMP annihilation cross section

v. relative velocity of $\chi\bar{\chi}$

Assuming freeze-out during radiation-dominated era

$$N = g \left(\frac{mT}{2\pi}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} e^{-\frac{m-\mu}{T}} \qquad H = 1.66g_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{T^2}{M_P}$$

- Determine freeze-out temperature T_D from $N(T_D)\langle \sigma v \rangle = H(T_D)$
- Determine number density at present: $N(T_0) = N(T_D) \left(\frac{T_0}{T_D}\right)^3$
- Determine density parameter:

$$\left(\begin{array}{cc} \Omega_{\chi} = \frac{N(T_0)m}{\rho_c} & \fbox{Constrain} \\ \text{parameters by} & \Omega_{\chi} < 1 \end{array} \right)$$

$$\rho_c = \frac{3H_0^2}{8\pi G_N} = 1.05 \times 10^{-5} h^2 \text{ GeV cm}^{-3}$$
PDG 14





Kerstin Kunze

- Dark energy
- Evidence for dark energy
- Nature of dark energy?

- Evidence from observations of
- supernovae (Cosmology 1)
- large scale structure BAO (baryon acoustic oscillations) in galaxy correlation functions
- CMB

• BAO - baryon acoustic oscillations and distance measurement

 The acoustic oscillations of the baryon-fluid before decoupling lead to the acoustic peak structure observed in the angular power spectra of the CMB temperature anisotropies and polarization. They also manifest themselves in the clustering of galaxies at late times.



• BAO - baryon acoustic oscillations and distance measureme

 Sound horizon at decoupling is characteristic scale of CMB fluctuations. It is imprinted in galaxy clustering today.

(comoving scale)

 $105h^{-1}\,{\rm Mpc}$

- In galaxy redshift survey measure at different redshifts:
- The preferred **angular separation** between galaxies at some redshift (perp. LOS).

Along LOS: redshift separation

$$\Delta z = r_s H(z)/c$$





Kerstin Kunze

Cosmology

CLASHEP15

WiggleZ: distance-redshift relation with BAO



Blake et al. 2011

- CMB constraints on dark energy
- A cosmological constant Λ can be effectively described as a perfect fluid with the equation of state

$$p_{\Lambda} = -\rho_{\Lambda}$$



 \checkmark leads to accelerated expansion

- There are other possible models using scalar fields or using a different theory of gravity (not Einstein general relativity).
- Allowing for a more general equation of state for dark energy with w a constant:

$$p_{DE} = w\rho_{DE}$$

• Planck15 constraints on w:

using Planck data + astrophysical data

$$w = -1.006 \pm 0.045$$



consistent with expected value for a cosmological constant

• Test more general, time-dependent equation of state:



$$p_{DE} = w \rho_{DE}$$



- Cosmological constant problem
- Estimate the value of cosmological constant assuming that it is a vacuum energy density $\Lambda=8\pi G\rho_{vac}$.
- Quantum field theory: describe vacuum fluctuations by simple harmonic oscillators $E = \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega$
- To identify dark energy with vacuum fluctuations, integrate over all states in a volume V. Quantum states in volume V, with wave number $k = p/\hbar$ between k and k+dk and integrated over all directions, is $4\pi V k^2 dk/(2\pi)^3$.

• Total energy per unit volume of all oscillators:

$$\epsilon = \frac{E}{V} = \frac{\hbar}{4\pi^2} \int \omega_k k^2 dk \quad \text{where} \quad \omega_k^2 = k^2 c^2 + \frac{1}{m^2} c^4 / \hbar^2$$

- Integral divergent \longrightarrow introduce upper cut-off k_m or $E_m \gg mc^2$.
- Consider relativistic limit: $\omega_k \simeq kc$

$$\bullet = \frac{\hbar c}{16\pi^2} k_m^4 = \frac{E_m^4}{16\pi^2(\hbar c)^3}$$

Kerstin Kunz

oscillator mass

- What is the upper cut-off E_m ?
- Expect quantum field theory to fail at the Planck scale





The observed value is only a tiny fraction of the predicted one.

Kerstin Kunze	e
---------------	---

- Conclusions
- Many open problems, e.g., what is dark matter? What is dark energy?
- Many observations and more will be coming in the near future.
- Astrophysical and cosmological observations can provide additional constraints on particle physics.